LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

Black and White

A Survey and Analysis by R.P.D.

★

Benefits of Disarmament

set forth by two trade union general secretaries:
R. W. Briginshaw: Percy Belcher

★

Forbid the Banns

Bert Ramelson discusses Clause 4 compromise

ZIG-ZAGS AND SKIRMISHES
by Quaestor

CAMPAIGNERS—UNITE!
by S. R. Broadbridge

IT'S OUR FUTURE
by Eiblis O'Shea

SHOSTAKOVITCH
reviewed by Alan Bush

MAY · 1960

One Shilling and Sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GALE FORCE

WHAT TIMES we live in! Winds of change blow from the four corners of the earth this seventieth May Day —from America, Alabama and Algeria to Aldermaston, from Tibet to Trafalgar Square. Each year, surrounded by our British banners, we call to mind those in other lands in the forefront of the struggle. We see faces of all colours, for the spirit of the international working-class movement is non-racial. This year for most of us in the foreground there will be the dignified and determined, grave and smiling Africans whom we have seen day after day on the television screen. The earth may well seem to shake as Africa's millions too begin to march. And I shall be thinking of another who will be eagerly looking toward them—Lachi, the serf girl. When she was 13, an army came over the mountains and opened a school in her village. Because Lachi longed to learn to read and write there, her serf-owner mistress beat her. But hearing her screams the soldiers came and rescued her. So Lachi joined the army as they marched and built roads all the way from her home in Chamdo to Lhasa, working with the hospital attendants. Asked: 'Wasn't the work too hard for you at that age?' Lachi smiled and replied: 'When I was ten, I had to carry my mistress on my back. No work the army gave me was as hard as that'. Now in Tibet after studying in Peking, Lachi will celebrate this May Day amongst her fellow ex-serfs, whose owners have fled over the border to India. She has gained her freedom, and they have lost theirs to exploit her, for ever. Less than ten short years ago an illiterate child serf; today centuries ahead of her parents' generation. How well Lachi and the Africans could understand each other. What heights will the African peoples have reached in another ten short years? Already we begin to glimpse the immense strength they will bring to the world. These are times when things are happening throughout the world at revolutionary speed. Hence the tremendous wind of change which can sweep away even mushroom clouds—can and will, as the peoples begin to use their giant strength. 'The best proof that my people are "ready for self-government" is that they demand it', Dr. Hastings Banda said on reaching England after release from a year in the Nyasaland gaol. That is also true much nearer home than Africa.

In 'the West', subject to lies, witch-hunting and war propaganda, we sometimes overlook how things are changing around us—the inch-by-inch retreat forced upon reaction. Glance back less than nine years ago, when one of America's mass-sale weeklies, *Collier's*, devoted its 132-page issue of October 27, 1951, to forecasting the future. It set the scene in this year, 1960, for a retrospect of 'Russia's Defeat and Occupation'. Broadcasters columnists, novelists, military strategists and others—including the trade union leader, Walter Reuther—contributed their expertise in tones ranging from factual-type reporting to frank gloating mixed with nauseous piety. Writing with the 'Occupation Forces' and the date-line 'Moscow, 1960', Robert E. Sherwood describes the 'history' of the Third World War, which began on May 10, 1952 and ended 'when Russia had disintegrated into complete chaos, by January 1955'. On the opposite page, a lurid painting shows the first atom-bomb strike on Moscow 'on July 22, 1953'. This piece of early cold war propaganda which, when it was first published, caused both the

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

BLACK AND WHITE

Your bond is not mere colour of skin but the deeper experience of wage slavery and contempt.

W. E. B. Dubois, Message to Accra Conference, December, 1958.

MAY Day, 1960, dawns at one of the highest moments of the long battle of human liberation. At the Summit Conference the choice of peace or war for the future of the world is approaching the anvil of decision. In South Africa the choice of slavery or freedom is being presented with an urgency which is searing the conscience of mankind.

The blood of the martyrs of Sharpeville and Langa, the screams of men, women and children lashed and beaten up and shot indiscriminately in the streets and in their homes, the mass heroism and resistance of African national patriots unarmed in face of their butchers—all these are the signals that herald the approaching downfall of the vile system of 'apartheid' slavery. A century ago the execution of John Brown, whose soul goes marching on, heralded the legal abolition of slavery in the United States, even though the struggle continues today at new heights in the Southern States to end the heritage of that accursed foundation of colour slavery on which the fortunes of the wealthy in Britain and the United States have been built.

CONTENTS

Vol. XLII MAY · 1960

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: *Black and White,* by R.P.D. ...	193
FORBID THE BANNS, by Bert Ramelson	206
ZIG-ZAGS AND SKIRMISHES, by Quæstor	211
BENEFITS OF DISARMAMENT, by R. W. Briginshaw	221
BENEFITS OF DISARMAMENT, by Percy Belcher	222
CAMPAIGNERS—UNITE! by S. R. Broadbridge	224
IT'S OUR FUTURE, by Eiblis O'Shea	226
FAILURE OF 'MIXED ECONOMY', by John Eaton	229
VIEWS OF THE WORLD, by W. Moore and A. McDonald ...	233
DRAWING: The First May Day, 1890	216-217
Book Reviews:	
Dmitri Shostakovich, by D. Rabinovich: *Alan Bush* ...	236
Entertainment in the Soviet Union: *Harry Francis* ...	237
The Foundry Workers, by H. J. Fyrth and H. Collins: *T. Ainley*	238
The First Indian War of Independence, by K. Marx and F. Engels: *C. P. Dutt* ...	239

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Four decades ago the butchery of 379 Indians at Amritsar heralded the approaching end of British rule in India. Today the speed of events is greater. Africa Year 1960 was the slogan proclaimed already at the beginning of the year. That was before Sharpeville. Now the battle for African freedom, all over the continent, and above all in the key fortress of barbarous servitude and racial terror, in South Africa, visibly in the sight of all occupies the forefront of the international situation.

Their Cause Is Ours

Never before has such universal anger, horror, indignation and protest swept so immediately and swiftly through every country in the world as over the events in South Africa. The truth of fascism and Nazism was long concealed and distorted by governments and official press in the West until years later after the outbreak of war the White Paper giving the long withheld dispatches about the concentration camps was published as an item of progaganda. But here is the direct descendant of Nazism in action, the open admirers and disciples of Hitlerism also during the war now constituted as a government and acting with an indiscriminate violence and terror which even their Nazi tutors, today entrenched in their midst, might envy. In vain the see-no-evil (except in communism) diplomats and ministerial appeasers try to deprecate popular criticism and protest as likely to cause embarrassment or constitute intervention in a 'domestic' question. They cannot escape their own responsibility in this matter. From the blood and tears of African slaves the rich tide of golden tribute flows today into the Tory mansions of Britain, just as of old the slave trade built their fortunes. With sure instinct popular feeling throughout the world has recognised that this struggle against racial fascist terror in South Africa is no domestic question, but the common concern of all of us. Mankind 'cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free'.

What is 'Apartheid'?

How is it possible that the horrors of the slavery regime in South Africa (and Southern Rhodesia) could have been so long held hidden from wider general consciousness, beyond progressive and democratic circles (but with extending protest among these, as shown in the widening support for the international boycott campaign since its inception in the summer of last year and extension to the Labour Party this year) until the explosion of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sharpeville blew up the conspiracy of silence and brought the monster into the centre of the international arena? One of the reasons is the customary deception of language always used by modern exploiting classes to cover a very different content. Just as the 'mixed economy' is used to describe modern monopoly capitalism, 'integration' to describe colonialism in Algeria, or 'multi-racialism' to describe the refusal of universal suffrage democracy in British settler-dominated colonies in Eastern and Central Africa, so 'Apartheid' has been coined in the jargon of South African exploiter politics to describe the most elaborate apparatus for the subjection and servitude of the majority of the population yet devised in any state (an even more complex and complete subjection and servitude than fascism).

Myth and Reality

'Apartheid' might be imagined by the innocent outsider to mean, and in the bland explanations offered by South African politicians for foreign consumption is described as if it meant, that the two so-called 'races', 'European' and African (or 'Bantu' in the deliberately illiterate terminology adopted by them to designate the various African peoples, with long and proud histories, concerned), as well as the 'Coloured' and 'Asian', are so different in language, tradition and culture that in their mutual interest they should best develop separately without contact. If the logic of this argument were to be followed literally, it would evidently point to the practical conclusion that there should be 'European Reserves' for the European minority, on an area of territory proportionate to their minority numbers, in order that they should be able to live according to their supposed wishes separately from the African majority. But heaven help the simple-minded Candide who might expect to find this accurate fulfilment of the alleged doctrine. The exactly contrary reality was comically illustrated (in the midst of the tragedy) when the Day of Mourning on March 28 and the general strike of African labour brought the South African economy to a standstill, and the bitter complaint went up that the European ladies were having to wash up their own dishes. That the White folk should wash up their own crockery and the Africans theirs might have seemed an ideal fulfilment of 'Apartheid'. On the contrary, it was regarded as a gross violation of the principle.

Structure of Slavery

The essential purpose of allocating the African three-quarters majority of the population to 'reserves' on less than one-eighth of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the territory of their own country, while declaring the rest of the country 'European' territory, is not in order that the African majority should live separately on these reserves, but that they should not be able to live on them. The nominal confinement of the eleven million Africans to twelve per cent of the territory, on which it is physically impossible for them to maintain life, is only a hypocritical device ('Apartheid') to ensure that the greatest part of their able-bodied manpower shall be compelled to seek employment in the European 88 per cent as 'alien' wage-workers without rights in their own country, cut off from their wives and families, forbidden by law to acquire skills (reserved for European workers), and in practice pass-law serfs, either on the farms (two and a half millions) or in the mines and factories (half a million) or as servants in the households of the European masters. On this elementary basis of expropriation, deprivation of rights and subjection, the vast apparatus of pass laws and kindred legislation is erected, with savage penalties for every breach (three-quarters of a million sentenced annually for breaches of the pass laws) and serving to provide European farmers with convict labour in privately owned and run convict jails on the European farms. Such is the modern structure of slavery in A.D. 1960, elaborated with all the ingenious cruelty of a Malan, a Strijdom and a Verwoerd, compared with which the world of Simon Legree was an idyll.

Freedom Struggle

Against this vicious system of enslavement the freedom struggle of the African people has moved forward on a new and extended basis since the adoption of the Freedom Charter by the Congress Alliance on June 26, 1956. This Charter was adopted by the unity of the African National Congress (the major representative organisation of the African people), the Indian Congress, the Coloured People's Congress and the Congress of Democrats (composed largely of progressive Europeans). The Congress Alliance thus represents the unity of the progressive democratic representatives of all four sections of the population, which 'Apartheid' seeks to divide, with the African National Congress as the decisive force. The Government replied to the Freedom Charter with the mass Treason Trial under the 'Suppression of Communism' Act. The Treason Trial was opened in 1956, and formally still continues, although the majority, if not all, of those charged have since been arrested or detained under the present Emergency.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boycott

In December, 1958, the decision was reached at the Accra All-African Peoples' Conference, on the proposal of the African National Congress, to call for an international boycott of South African goods. The boycott was launched on June 26, 1959, the third anniversary of the Freedom Charter. It was widely taken up, including by the Government of Jamaica, and by trade union, co-operative and progressive organisations in many countries. In Britain the Boycott Movement was initiated in the second half of 1959 by the co-operation of the Committee of African Organisations and the Movement for Colonial Freedom. By the beginning of 1960 support was so strong that the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress, as also the progressive religious organisation, Christian Action, together with the Liberal and Communist Parties and progressive Conservatives like Lord Altrincham, officially joined the Boycott Movement and called for a boycott during the month of March. Hundreds of local Boycott Committees were formed all over the country, expressing the unity of all sections of the working class and democratic movement in support of this common aim. Originally the official support of the Labour Party and T.U.C. for the boycott was intended to be confined to the month of March. But the events of Sharpeville made it abundantly clear that it would have to be extended beyond. It is understood that the proposal has been put forward for the Boycott Committee to become an Anti-Apartheid Committee, to continue the campaign until the evil system of 'Apartheid' is ended.

Macmillan's Tour

It was in this situation not only of the universal freedom upsurge throughout the African continent, but also of sharpening international democratic concern over the crisis in Africa and the beginnings of solidarity action, that Premier Macmillan made his tour of British colonies and Commonwealth territories in Africa during the first six weeks of 1960, culminating in his Capetown speech to the South African parliament on February 3. In face of the advance of African national revolt British imperialism has sought to adapt its 'Asian' model, and to develop a perspective for the 'constitutional' advance of a series of selected African former colonial territories to the status of independent states under governments still with close connections with the old imperialist state apparatus and likely to protect imperialist economic assets and exploitation. It was with this perspective in view of partial adaptation to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

African national struggle, while seeking at the same time to maintain the interests of the European colonial exploiting monopolies and settlers, that Macmillan exercised all his diplomatic adroitness in conducting his tour of British colonial territories or newly ex-colonial territories in Africa, as well as visiting the smouldering danger zones of the Central African Federation and South Africa.

From Capetown to Sharpeville

In South Africa Macmillan sought with his customary facing-both-ways ingenuity to bridge the gulf of the contradictions of imperialism in Africa by simultaneously exchanging compliments with his hosts, the racialist-fascist Verwoerd Government, complying with their wishes to meet no African leaders, and deprecating the boycott, and at the same time expressing in his speech to the South African parliament on February 3 a diplomatically worded warning and dissent on the dangers of maintaining a rigid policy of racial suppression in the modern world. In vain. These subtle manoeuvres could not paper over the gulf between the real policies of colonialism and racialism, most brutally and openly expressed by the settlers on the spot, whether Algerian *colons* or the Welensky Government or above all the South African Government, and the aspirations of the African people. 'South Africa has been given formal notice', commented the leading Government organ, *Die Burger,* 'of a state of emergency in her relations with the West'. Macmillan's 'enlightened' Capetown speech had been preceded by his own Government's atrocities and killing of unarmed Africans in Kenya and Nyasaland. It was followed by Sharpeville and its sequel in South Africa.

Campaign Against the Pass Laws

In South Africa by the beginning of this year the campaign was carried forward to the preparation for the next planned objective of non-violent mass refusal to carry the passes of slavery. This stage had been planned by the African National Congress to open on April 1. The campaign was, however, precipitated a fortnight earlier through the action of a smaller section which had broken away on grounds of tactical differences from the Congress to found the 'Pan-Africanist Congress'. The tactical differences do not concern us here, since they belong to the internal problems of the movement in South Africa; the common immediate objective of all sections is the abolition of the pass laws; and Government repression has fallen on both organisations. So far as can be seen from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here, the tactical differences turned on objection to the Congress Alliance conception of co-operation of African with non-African progressive democratic organisations willing to fight Apartheid, criticism of the African National Congress as 'communist-inspired', and the trend to see the conflict in purely racial terms (black versus white, irrespective of political outlook). The main base of the P.A.C. was in Sharpeville and Langa; and it was here that the Government's ruthless firing on peaceful demonstrations of unarmed Africans and killing of scores of men, women and children opened the present major crisis and aroused the horror of the world.

Explosion

The Sharpeville massacre was not the end, but the beginning of a major conflict for African freedom, which has already borne many of the characteristic features of a revolutionary situation—when the ruling regime of oppression finds itself increasingly unable to maintain its rule in the old way and the masses refuse to be governed in the old way. The sequence of events is here important. The Sharpeville massacre on March 21 was in effect the 'Bloody Sunday' not just the repetition of the prototype of an Amritsar, which temporarily terrorised the movement in the Punjab, but leading, like Bloody Sunday, to a still higher level of struggle. The masses were not intimidated, but thronged in thousands to the police stations to court arrest for failure to carry passes, until by March 25 the police authorities admitted that it was impossible to arrest them all because there was 'no room' in the prisons (Capetown police chief, March 25).

The Sixteen Days

Thus developed the Sixteen Days, from March 21 to April 6, during which the height of the mass movement paralysed the authorities from being able to enforce the operation of the pass laws. On March 26 the police authorities announced temporary suspension of arrests for failure to carry passes. This enforced concession was not a change of policy. It was accompanied by the announcement that enforcement of the pass laws would be resumed as soon as diminution of the 'tension' made it possible, and that new repressive legislation would be immediately introduced against African organisations and leaders. This resumption of enforcement was officially announced on April 6, as soon as the new terror had been imposed with the proclamation of the Emergency, banning of the African organisations and wholesale arrests. Thus the enforced

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

temporary concession only revealed the crack in the power of the regime, and so far from appeasing the popular movement, raised it higher.

General Strike

The African freedom movement replied with the call for a Day of Mourning on March 28, a mass general strike and the burning of passes to demonstrate the demand for the ending forever of the pass system in place of the temporary suspension of its operation. The general strike had full support (at least 80 per cent according to the London *Times*, 95 per cent according to the American magazine *Time*), together with a hartal of Indian shopkeepers. South African economy was thus brought to a standstill on March 28. South African shares slumped. By April 8 they were reported to have fallen by £125 millions. The potential strength of the Africans as the basis of the South African economy was demonstrated.

Government Terrorism

The Government replied with new terror legislation, introduced on March 28, to ban the A.N.C., P.A.C. and all African or other progressive organisations, with ferocious penalties of five years prison, ten strokes of the lash and fines up to £500. Nevertheless, the movement continued with more demonstrations, strikes and burning of passes. On March 30 the Government proclaimed an Emergency, and arrested 234 leaders of all the African organisations and also progressive European spokesmen in the Liberal Party or Congress of Democrats. This was followed by widespread further arrests, with censorship forbidding the publication of the facts or names of those arrested. The African liberation movement replied with gigantic mass marches for the release of their leaders, notably the march of 30,000 to Capetown. The Government called out Army and Navy units to surround African townships, and mobilised the Territorials or European Volunteer Reserve. Orders to shoot to kill were given, and indiscriminate violence employed to prevent further marches and terrorise the Africans back to work. By April 6 renewal of enforcement of the pass laws was announced. Meanwhile the United Nations Security Council on April 1 by a vote of 9 to 0 (Britain and France abstaining) had carried the resolution 'deploring' the actions of the South African Government and calling on it to 'abandon its policies of apartheid and racial discrimination'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sitting on Bayonets

'You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them.' Napoleon's dictum was wasted on Verwoerd, Erasmus and Swart. These gentlemen believe rather in the literal truth of Carlyle's dictum 'God has put into every white man's hand a whip to flog the black'. The preliminary trial of strength during these days of crisis has revealed a series of distinctive features of the character of the struggle in South Africa. The first has been the Government's reliance absolutely and in effect exclusively on armed violence, repression, bans, arrests and terrorism as its sole weapon against the unarmed movement of the African majority. Up to the time of writing there has so far been absolute rejection of any approach, customary in such conditions of crisis, towards negotiation, partial reforms or concessions, or attempts to separate and win over so-called 'moderate' leaders in order to demobilise an overwhelming majority mass movement. It is true that, since the armed forces (though not the police) in South Africa are exclusively European and racial in character, no question could arise of reflection of the mass movement within the armed forces. On the other hand, the weakness of reliance solely on armed force, without any social basis within the oppressed majority, has become increasingly manifest; and the impermanence of any 'settlement' on this basis has been warningly noted by outside observers of every political colour. Hence the manifest anxiety of fellow imperialists over this glaring disregard of the necessary technique of modern imperialism in face of the strength of the national liberation movement in the world today.

Working Class and National Liberation

The second distinctive feature of the African national liberation movement in the conditions of South Africa arises from the fact that the South African economy is based on African employed labour under virtual slave conditions. In all the other colonial territories the main body of the population, and the main basis of the national movement, is the peasantry exploited by imperialism (only Kenya and Southern Rhodesia represent partial exceptions, more comparable to South Africa). In South Africa, through the operation of the system of 'apartheid' servitude already described, the mass movement is overwhelmingly a movement of enslaved wage workers, denied the most elementary rights of organisation and held down by violence. The development of the national

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie (small traders, or intelligentsia educated in Christian missions or abroad) is very minute; the small traders are mostly Indians. There is no upper skilled section, since the Africans are debarred by law from skilled jobs and rates, which are the prerogative of European workers receiving twenty times an African wage. These conditions make organisation difficult, but the potential strength very great, once unity is achieved. This was shown by the united action of March 28, which brought the entire South African economy to a standstill, leaving the rulers no immediate answer save armed violence and wholesale arrests and terrorist intimidation.

International Repercussions

The third distinctive feature signalised by the events in South Africa has been the speed and extent of the international repercussions, not only within the working class and democratic movement in all countries, but also within the imperialist camp and among their governments. The storm aroused on an international scale by the events in South Africa has been more intensive and widespread than in almost any previous national struggle, including Algeria, and more comparable to that aroused by the Suez War. Alongside the universal popular support and solidarity, the reasons for special concern also among the ruling class of other countries in the imperialist camp, as revealed in the vote on the United Nations Security Council, are manifest. At a time when the imperialists are endeavouring to counter the national revolt in the majority of their African colonial territories by a policy of concessions, proclaiming a new and enlightened outlook and professing to repudiate racial denomination, the open and unconcealed racialism and reckless armed violence of the South African Government is an embarrassment to the other imperialists and even seen as a grave danger holding out the possibility of the loss of all Africa. Hence the complaints of the South African governmental spokesmen and racialist press that British imperialism is sacrificing them to the interests of its wider African policy. The equivocal position of the British Conservative Government was demonstrated in the United Nations, where previously Britain, France and fascist Portugal had been the three States daring to vote against a resolution condemning apartheid, and where now the British and French Governments judged it more prudent to abstain—and brought shame upon themselves by their abstention.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperialism and South Africa

On the other hand, it would be a dangerous illusion to regard the South African situation as a peculiar and anomalous 'internal question' of the South African ruling class (as the spokesmen of the Macmillan Government seek to pretend) separate from the interests and policy of international imperialism. Anglo-American imperialism, and especially British imperialism, has a powerful and dominant interest in the South African economy. Total overseas capital in South Africa at the end of 1959 was estimated at £1,580 million, with Britain holding 'more than half' the total (£865·6 million already in the census return of 1956) and the United States £250 million (*Financial Times*, March 31, 1960). Over fifteen hundred million golden (or diamond) reasons for extreme 'delicacy' in taking care not to offend the South African Government or do anything to upset the precarious balance of lucrative exploitation.

Dilemma of the Imperialists

From this arises the peculiar dilemma of the imperialists in relation to the present situation in South Africa. Gigantic fortunes have been made, and continue to be made, and vast incomes drawn by the wealthiest families in Britain, including ministerial families, from the slavery system of 'apartheid'. From the end of the nineteenth century and the Edwardian era 'Kaffirs' have played and continue to play a leading role on the London Stock Exchange. Hence the extreme nervousness when the reckless bull in a rage policy of the Verwoerd Government threatens to wreck the whole structure of African exploitation. But hence also the extreme hesitation to offend or get on the wrong foot with the Verwoerd Government so long as it remains the main physical bulwark of British imperialist interests and profits in South Africa. On the one hand, the South African Federation of Industries, mainly British, calls for immediate negotiations by the Government with 'moderate influential African leaders' and the replacement of the existing system of pass laws by a new reformed system of identity cards for all and limited control of movement of Africans. On the other hand, the United Party, the political organ of British interests, and constituting the 'Opposition' for the past ten years, has no alternative policy to Apartheid, and has supported the Verwoerd Government in all its actions in the present crisis and voted for all the new terror laws. No wonder Macmillan's Ministers can only

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mumble incoherently, when bombarded with awkward questions in parliament.

Towards What Goal?

We are still only at the beginning of the deeper conflict which has now opened in South Africa, and which, together with the Algerian war of independence in the North, has today come into the front line of the battle of liberation of the whole African continent. It would be premature at this stage to judge the immediate next phase of this still developing and explosive situation. The Verwoerd Government has for the moment re-established and reinforced its physical domination, but at heavy cost and with obvious and permanent insecurity. The sensitive barometer of the money market and the Stock Exchange has revealed the lack of confidence in the future. It may be assumed that British policy, in contact with associated interests in South Africa, will endeavour to manoeuvre for a less dangerously rigid strategy. Influential British interests, reflected by such leading press organs as *The Times*, would evidently wish to see a replacement of the Verwoerd Government by an alternative or Coalition (British and Afrikaner) Government which could show a 'new face' and make some concessions, whether of release of mass leaders or recognition of limited rights of organisation (the model represented by the release of Dr. Banda in Nyasaland, or drawing in of a few representative African leaders to junior ministerial positions in Kenya). But in the conditions of South Africa, with the elaborate apparatus of absolute racial suppression, the unity of the two main parties in upholding it, and the absence of any previous development of a privileged or compromising leading stratum in the African population, such methods of manoeuvre and partial concession are less easy to fulfil. The united demand of the entire African population of South Africa is maintained for the abolition of the Pass Laws and Apartheid, and is strengthened by universal international support.

Unity for Freedom

That is why the strongest possible international solidarity and practical support in unity with the struggle of the African population and all democrats in South Africa is now of such paramount importance. The Emergency Committee of the suppressed African National Congress has issued its call on April 4. In order to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolve 'the present grave crisis which is sweeping the country', the Congress has put forward the following urgent propositions:

1. *The State of Emergency must be ended, our leaders must be released, freedom of speech and organisation established.*

2. *Pass Laws must be abolished.*

3. *Wages must be raised to a minimum of at least £1 a day.*

4. *A new National Convention representing all the people on a fully democratic basis must be called to lay the foundations of a new Union, a non-racial democracy belonging to all South Africans and in line with the United Nations Charter and the views of all enlightened people everywhere in the world.*

These aims deserve and require international support with the united strength of the peoples of the world to hasten their fulfilment. During the past decade and a half the victory of national liberation has swept forward over the greater part of Asia and the Middle East. Now the battle goes forward in Latin America, and above all in the final reserve and bastion of imperialism and colonialism, in Africa, to win that victory of freedom which shall end for ever the shame of discrimination and servitude on the basis of race or colour, and thereby open the gates to the advance of united humanity.

April 12, 1960. R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

A MEMORY OF THE VOLGA FAMINE, 1921

The City of Samara on the Volga is the city more than any other indelibly impressed on my own mind.

My first visit to the U.S.S.R. was in 1921, at the time of the famine, and I had the opportunity of going down the Volga, this being the famine area, along with President Kalinin and his staff who were paying a special visit to this stricken area. The city that showed most evidence of the dire effects of the awful drought was Samara. I there saw such grim sights of famine effects and was present at the meetings of local Soviets where the members came to report and to confer with Comrade Kalinin, that although I have visited the Soviet Union a number of times, Samara is ever in mind when I think of Russia.

TOM MANN. May, 1935.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORBID THE BANNS

Meaning of the Compromise on Clause 4

Bert Ramelson

THE National Executive Committee of the Labour Party met on March 16 to resolve the crisis in the Party which had developed with tremendous speed and intensity around Clause 4. The outcome of the decision was to put up the banns for solemnising in Scarborough next October a marriage of convenience between the Right and the Left, with the Right as the dominant partner. Such a marriage would be a disaster for the Labour movement. It should forbid the banns.

The essence of the crisis is: what is to be the fundamental aim of the Labour movement? Is it to be socialism, or to rescue the capitalist establishment?

What is the significance of Clause 4*, written into the Labour Party constitution in 1918? It is clear and unambiguous. The aim is socialism, defined as a society based on the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. It was adopted as the fundamental aim of the movement as a result of the profound experiences of the people from the agonies of the first world war and under the impact of the October 1917 revolution. The lesson of these experiences embodied in Clause 4 was that no amount of tinkering with capitalism but only the ending of the system itself, would meet the needs and aspirations of the working class.

Though the Right-wing, which dominated its leadership since the inception of the Labour Party to this day, ignored Clause 4 in practice, it would be wrong to underestimate its significance, either as a stimulant to Left activities or as a hindrance to the Right-wing. The Right were certainly aware of this significance, and have always seen Clause 4 as an obstacle. Very careful preparations were made particularly over the last decade to prepare the ground for its burial. At the beginning of this decade began the 'theoretical' preparations with the publication of a whole spate of books, essays and pamphlets by scribes such as Crosland, Strachey and others. The aim of all these outpourings was to 'prove' that the capitalist leopard has not only changed its spots but has transformed itself into the harmless necessary cat. Ownership has ceded

*4. 'To secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service.'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its power to management who had a common interest with the workers in making industry efficient; with the introduction of welfare, exploitation ended and with the aid of Keynesian gimmicks economic crises and unemployment were no longer serious factors; whilst, with the withdrawal from India, Burma and Ceylon, imperialism and colonial exploitation were relics of the past. The conclusions to be drawn from this 'theorising' were obvious—not social transformation but improvement in the existing order was the need of the hour. Thus there was no longer any need for fundamental differences between the Tory, Liberal and Labour Parties—the quarrel between them being reduced to fringe arguments on how best to make capitalism work.

The next stage was to carry forward these concepts into two important practical documents—*Industry and Society* and *Plan for Progress*. The objective result of the adoption of these documents was for Labour to join the Tories in condemning and denigrating common ownership. It would be a mistake to regard these two policy statements as merely parts of a current election programme and of only transitory significance (which is the way they were 'put over'). They were the means adopted by the Right-wing to smuggle into the movement the phoney ideas of the possibility of planning without ownership and the 'mixed economy' as a permanent form of society.

It is a measure of the weakness of the non-marxist Left that some of them contributed to this state of affairs. Ian Mikardo's contribution to the *New Fabian Essays* concentrated on proving the divorce between ownership and power, on the common interest of management and workers and on the new role of the trade unions to advise management how to increase productivity as the best means of obtaining wage increases. Then there is the fact that *Industry and Society* and *Plan for Progress* were presented to successive Labour Party conferences as documents in 1957 and in 1958 unanimously supported by the National Executive Committee which included Bevan, Wilson, Castle, Mikardo and Driberg. Is it any wonder at the confusion amongst the hundreds of Left delegates so that only a handful voted against these documents?

These were some of the events which emboldened the Right, following the debacle of the general election, to go over to the offensive against Clause 4. But the Right completely misread the position. Isolated from the mass movement, accustomed to easy victories and manoeuvred majorities, they were thunderstruck by the storm which broke round their heads. The powerful and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passionate feeling and the innate common sense of the working class was made manifest in the last six months. They could be misled to accept this or that phoney proposition in what they felt (albeit mistakenly) to be temporary tactical moves in the direction of socialism—but it is an entirely different matter to shift them from the simple proposition that it is no more possible to have socialism without common ownership than it is to live without breathing.

The movement grew daily to frustrate Gaitskell's plot against socialism. Day by day the number of resolutions for the retention of Clause 4 grew. The decisions of the Welsh and Yorkshire miners made it sure that the great National Union of Mineworkers would join the Transport and General Workers Union in leading the opposition. The number of resolutions on the agenda of the National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union would create difficulties for Mr. Carron to come to Gaitskell's rescue; similar resolutions were being passed by overwhelming majorities in trade union branches, constituency parties, trades councils and federations of trades councils, all of which had a profound effect on a growing number of Labour M.P.s. It became clear that if the delegates at Scarborough were to be given the clear choice between retention or rejection of Clause 4, Gaitskell and his supporters would be routed. It became equally clear that from the fundamental discussion around socialism—for that is in reality what has taken place—it could be the beginning of a much wider and profound movement challenging the whole range of right policies and the leadership which proposed such a betrayal.

Realising the growing strength of the opposition, the Right backed by the Tory press, began to seek a way out; they found refuge in the time-honoured weapon of confusion and ambiguity. George Brown (inspired, it is said, by Charles Pannell), both staunch supporters of Gaitskell, came to the rescue with the theory of the 'Old Testament' and the 'New Testament' as a unifying compromise. So the addendum adopted by the National Executive Committee (with one vote against) accepts this theory of the two testaments—as we shall see, two mutually exclusive testaments.

The statement opens with the misleading sentence that it 're-affirms, amplifies and clarifies . . .' Clause 4. It would have been more truthful to say that it contradicts, dilutes and confuses the objects as contained in Clause 4. The Right-wing had to bow to the storm by retaining Clause 4 and to abandon the original plot to eliminate it altogether. To that extent it is a setback for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Right. But it would be an error to see only this positive aspect and fail to see the dangerous reformist concepts which have been smuggled into the constitution: concepts which are at the root of Labour's failure to bring about fundamental change; concepts which were the real reasons for Labour's three successive electoral defeats; concepts which negate the essence of Clause 4. The concept of a permanent 'mixed economy' is now enshrined in the constitution by including the phrase '. . . in recognising that both public and private enterprise have a place in economy. . . .' This is a denial not a reaffirmation of Clause 4.

The concept of the 'shareholders state' with the state sharing in the exploitation of the workers and no say in the industry it invests in—the essence of *Industry and Society,* is now constitutionally recognised as a form of public ownership, by the insertion of the phrase '. . . and public participation in private concerns. . . .' This is a dilution, not 'amplification' of Clause 4.

The false concept—despite all experience to the contrary—of control without ownership (the essence of *Plan for Progress*) is right at the heart of the 'clarifying' addendum: 'It is believed that these social and economic objectives can be achieved only through extension of common ownership substantial enough to give the community power over the commanding heights of the economy'.

Brave words, but . . . . Note that the objective is not to take over the 'commanding heights' but 'power over' them. As the Right-wing have peddled for years the 'theory' of controlling the economy with the sole aid of the gospel according to their Saint Keynes, it would be fatal to interpret that as meaning the socialisation of the 'commanding heights'.

Gaitskell and his associates will find justification in this New Testament for any and every policy he and the Right have ever advocated. Indeed Wyatt and Jay hastened to assure us of just that. In the light of growing movement of opposition it is understandable why Gaitskell was eager to grasp at this 'compromise'. The tragedy is that so many of the Left who played such a big part in mobilising the opposition should have fallen into the trap of a spurious unity when the movement was on the threshold of victory.

Those associated with the Left whether on the National Executive Committee, Parliamentary Labour Party, Victory for Socialism or *Tribune,* who are giving the impression that the battle around fundamental aims is over, that the socialist aim has been rescued, if it were ever in danger (and some have even doubts on that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

score)—are doing a great disservice to the movement. They are demobilising, demoralising and confusing a growing army ready and anxious to do battle against capitalism and all it stands for. The battle is far from over, it has only begun. It can be brought to a victorious conclusion next October. It will if the delegates to the next Labour Party conference are given—what they have a right to expect—a clear and unambiguous choice and are not side-tracked by double talk, formulas designed to confuse, and forms of words which mean all things to all men—the real purpose of the addendum.

The need of the moment is to extend even wider the growing forces of opposition to capitalist ideas within our movement. This will be achieved to the extent that we succeed in bringing out into the open the confusions, contradictions and smuggled-in capitalist concepts with which the addendum is riddled.

In this, the coming national conferences of the trade unions are of vital importance. These will provide the opportunity for the heart of the Labour movement to reaffirm their loyalty to their own constitutions, to determine to stand shoulder to shoulder with the mighty Transport and General Workers Union in the defence of socialism, to amend the N.E.C. addendum so that there can be no dubiety that what is required is the socialisation of the 'commanding heights'. If any clarification is needed it is to spell out that the 'commanding heights' are the 600 giant industrial, financial and property-owning firms which dominate our economy and lives; and that all references to shareholding and private ownership be chucked out of the window. Nor is this the responsibility of the trade unions alone—every constituency and ward Labour Party, every Co-operative branch should marshal its forces for such a stand.

Douglas Goldring (1887-1960)

Douglas Goldring, novelist and well-known man of letters, died at Deal on April 9. He was a friend and supporter of *Labour Monthly* and a valued contributor.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ZIG-ZAGS AND SKIRMISHES

On the way to the Summit — Quaestor

AS the date of the Summit meeting approaches, it becomes more and more clear that the decision on whether the world is to move out of the shadow of a third world war lies today, as never before, in the hands of the peoples. It was with good reason that President de Gaulle, in his speech on April 7 in Westminster Hall, contrasted 'the permanent threat of gigantic and instantaneous weapons of destruction' with 'the powerful current which seems to bear the mass of the people and statesmen towards easier relations'. Apply this test to the important international events of the last few weeks, and see how true it is.

Nuclear tests. On this point the pressure of opinion, from the ordinary men and women of all countries, has been concentrated from all directions in recent months. On March 19, at a specially-summoned meeting of the Geneva conference, the Soviet Government—which has campaigned for their banning since May, 1955—announced that it was accepting the United States proposal for a treaty prohibiting all tests except the smaller underground explosions, and for joint research on ways of checking the latter: provided there was a simultaneous voluntary undertaking by all concerned not to make such underground tests meanwhile. There have been many occasions in the past when Soviet acceptance of Western proposals was the signal for Western governments to run away from them; and on this occasion it was 'no secret that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon have been pressing for a resumption of small underground tests' and that the Soviet proposal was 'denounced by influential members of Congress as a "phony" ' (*The Times*, Washington correspondent, March 25—one among many).

However, they failed. On March 29 President Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan declared that they accepted the Soviet proposals (for which there was world-wide support)—although not agreeing to the four or five years which had been suggested by the Soviet Union as the period of the 'moratorium' on the smaller tests. Moreover the prospective Democratic candidates in the next Presidential elections both assured Eisenhower that they would continue the voluntary undertaking, if elected.

Khrushchov's visit to Paris (March 23-April 3). At the outset, every effort was made in France by the authorities and the capitalist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

press to isolate the Soviet party from the people, and to cry down the political importance of the visit. Everyone who read the British newspapers at that time knows that they did the same, by sneers, by insinuations and by direct misrepresentation—such as the suggestion (which the correspondents could not possibly check) that 'only the Communists' were cheering Khrushchov.

But the French people themselves broke down this barrier of falsehood, by the tremendous reception they gave the Soviet visitors in factories and villages, in Socialist strongholds like Lille and Conservative centres like Rheims. 'Khrushchov, to the balcony!' became the slogan of all France, roared by hundreds of thousands. As the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party put it: 'The fanatical adversaries of the Soviet Union, the champions of the cold war, turned out to be isolated and paralysed amid an entire people demonstrating its joy at receiving representatives of the U.S.S.R. in its country' (*Humanité*, April 9). The most openly (or slimily) hostile British newspapers had to admit the same. For eleven days, said *The Guardian* (April 4), Khrushchov had 'dominated the scene in France'; 'the cordiality of Khrushchov's send-off indicated that he had achieved a personal as well as a political success', cabled the Paris correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph;* and even the *New Statesman* (April 2) squeezed out of itself the admission that 'in no other Western country has Khrushchov been so acclaimed'.

No less clearly was this result felt in the final communiqué of Khrushchov's talks with de Gaulle. The two statesmen were able to record 'a considerable increase in trade turnover between the U.S.S.R. and France' in recent years (which Britain cannot), and to plan for a further increase up to 1965; and they agreed on the signature of agreements for co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy and in other scientific research (notably on ways of fighting cancer and leukaemia). In particular, they declared disarmament to be 'the most important and pressing problem of the present day', laying stress on the development of friendly relations and co-operation between France and the U.S.S.R. as promoting the further reduction of international tension—which had already made possible the coming Summit meeting. 'Changes for the better have taken place in Franco-Soviet relations', was the French Communist Party's summing up of the results of the visit: and, we must add, they are bound to be reflected in world relations.

De Gaulle's visit to London (April 5-7) already showed this—and not only in the words of the French president quoted earlier,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or in his reference (overlooked by most British newspapers) to the 'esteem' in which the Western leaders and Nikita Khrushchov hold each other. The press, indeed, rightly underlined the section of de Gaulle's speech which reaffirmed the previous attitude of his government, so harmful to the prospects of disarmament—that France can give up nuclear tests and the making of nuclear weapons only when 'others have ceased to possess them'. It will take all the effect of an Anglo-Soviet-American agreement to stop nuclear tests to shake such an attitude—and that agreement has yet to be signed.

But the most significant *new* feature of de Gaulle's speech (overlooked even more understandably by most capitalist newspapers) was his declaration about peace in Europe. While it should not 'widen divisions nor poison wounds, including those suffered by the German people', said the President (here followed the inevitable bow to Adenauer's régime as 'a vital part of the West and our common ally'), it should 'enable Europe to lead her own life, thanks to the balance established between her two parts which follow different ways of life'. He hoped to see 'the progressive diminution of opposition between these two ways of life, in a peaceful atmosphere'. Rightly understood, these words mean that the supreme interest of the nations of Europe is to agree to live together peaceably, whatever their social, economic and political differences—and that the existence of two German States, one in each part of Europe, one Socialist and the other capitalist, must not be allowed to upset the balance. This was in effect a repudiation of those who want to keep Europe in a perpetual turmoil of tension and alarm by their threats of 'liberation', their propaganda for reconquest of 'lost homelands' and their claims to be a bulwark of Christian civilisation against the 'East' (just like Kaiser Wilhelm II and Adolf Hitler).

Can anyone doubt that, speaking in this way and fresh from Khrushchov's visit, de Gaulle was responding to the wishes of the vast majority of the ordinary working folk of Europe?

But where their pressure is not being brought to bear, the picture is very different.

The Ten-State Disarmament Committee (March 15-April 12). The two plans tabled at Geneva have shown as clear as crystal who wants disarmament and who has to be pushed towards it, struggling all the way.

In the five Socialist States represented (U.S.S.R., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania) the working people own the means of production. The new material values turned out every year are the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

income of the whole nation. When part of them are used for armaments and armies, the whole people feel it a waste, and are actively interested in ending it. The five Socialist delegations accordingly brought forward Khrushchov's proposals submitted to the United Nations Assembly on September 18 last—*within 12 to 18 months*: reduction of American, Soviet and Chinese forces to 1,700,000 each, British and French to 650,000 each, and others as agreed at an international conference; with corresponding reduction of armaments; all to take place under supervision of an international control agency, beginning its operations at the same time as demobilisation begins.

Within another 18 to 24 months: demobilisation of all remaining national forces, apart from police and militia units (including those on foreign soil); closing down of all military bases abroad; stopping the manufacture of conventional weapons—all under still more extensive international control.

Within one more year: destruction and prohibition of all nuclear and rocket weapons and air forces; dissolving of all general staffs, war ministries, etc., prohibition of military training and of 'defence' budgets—with international controllers ranging freely over all countries.

In the five capitalist States represented (Britain, France, U.S.A., Italy, Canada) groups of monopoly capitalists own the means of production. They use the workers' labour on these means for profit—and armaments are particularly profitable. What their economists call 'national income' is in reality a measure of the monopolists' appropriation, every year, of the fruits of the labour of their 'own' workers and of colonial and dependent peoples—against whom, as much as against each other, they maintain their armed forces. It is only very grudgingly, and under extreme pressure, that the monopolists agree to any weakening of their military machine. Accordingly, the Western plan tabled on March 15 proposed:

During an initial period of unstated duration, no reduction of armies or armaments whatsoever (in fact, 'ceilings' for American and Soviet forces of 2,500,000, higher than the levels they will shortly reach under existing plans); an immense volume of study of methods of control by an international disarmament organisation, collection of information about arms expenditure; and *storage* by each State of 'agreed types and quantities of conventional armaments'.

During a second period of unstated duration, after these 'preparatory studies': reduction of American and Soviet force-level 'ceilings'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to 2,100,000; further 'mothballing' (but not destruction, or prohibition of manufacture of improved types) of armaments, in agreed quantities; ending of production of 'fissionable materials for weapon purposes' (but not of nuclear weapons); prohibition of outer-space missiles; measures for protection against surprise attacks; and the calling of a disarmament conference.

After all this, prohibition of all nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction, establishment of international control over military budgets, reduction of national armed forces, 'after such further joint studies as may be necessary', to levels required by national security 'and fulfilment of obligations under the United Nations Charter'—which will include the establishment of an international police force.

Thus the manufacture of armaments—including nuclear weapons—would go on for an unstated number of years; the maintenance of vast armies, air forces and navies likewise; also the maintenance of huge stocks of weapons in storage too; and of course the whole machinery of war ministries, staffs, training colleges, bases abroad, etc.

Where would disarmament come in?

It is interesting to note that, whereas in 1955 the Western powers were refusing to consider the abolition of nuclear weapons owing to supposed Soviet preponderance in conventional armaments (huge armies and air forces: never a word said about U.S. and British navies), they ran away from their own proposals for cutting these armaments when the U.S.S.R. accepted them—and have proposed *higher levels* in March, 1960! During these latest Geneva talks, the Western delegates began by reproaching the Socialist States, on the contrary, for postponing nuclear arms reduction until the final stage of their plan; yet when the Soviet delegate Zorin, on March 21, said *that they were ready for a complete ban on nuclear weapons at any stage in the disarmament programme,* and the Rumanian delegate Misincescu, on March 31, said they were prepared for it to take place *at the very first stages of general and complete disarmament*—the capitalist press even concealed the fact from British readers!

Only the most active intervention of the broad mass of the people, bombarding the Summit meeting with demands for agreement on immediate disarmament measures, will shake the whole issue out of deadlock. That is the lesson of the first month's talks at Geneva.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The First May Day 1890

Seventy years ago, the first May Day festival of the working
The decision to hold it was taken the previous year at the Paris
and William Morris. The contemporary drawing shows the hug
of Frederick Engels, speaking from one of the platforms.

Engels considered this as 'the grandest and most important pa
awakened from its forty years' winter sleep, *again entered the m*
of the old Chartists are entering the line of battle'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was celebrated in the main cities of the chief capitalist countries. ·national Socialist Congress, attended from Britain by Keir Hardie ɔwd in London's Hyde Park with John Burns, then 'an old friend'

f the whole May Day festival' that 'the English proletariat, newly *nent of its class*'. He emphasised this, saying 'The grandchildren

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany. Fact after fact, during the last few weeks, drives home the increasingly monstrous role, as a centre of new Fascism and more and more open war preparations, of the Federal German Republic—the capitalists' and landowners' State deliberately re-created for the second time by the Western Allies after 1945, contrary to their solemn pledges in wartime and at Potsdam, just as they did after 1918 and for the same reason: to 'resist the Reds, who are a real danger'. And like Hitler's state, Adenauer's Fourth Reich is proving a vulture which looks *both* ways, taking advantage of differences between east and west and meanwhile getting ready to strike in its own interests, in whichever direction suits them best.

March 23. Surprise inspections at West German arms factories —supposed to be ensured six years ago by 'West European Union' —were revealed at the latter's headquarters to be still impossible because the West Germans 'will not agree' (*Daily Herald*, March 24); a statement which *The Times* Bonn correspondent made more precise (April 12) by explaining that the West German Government had 'failed to submit' to its parliament two conventions of December 14, 1957, which would authorise such snap inspections.

March 25. General Norstad, the Allied Supreme Commander, exchanged letters with the Danish Defence Minister providing for Danish depots for 'German NATO land forces' (*The Times*, March 26).

March 27. Seebohm, Adenauer's Minister of Transport, told a delegate conference of the 'Sudetenland Association' (composed of Germans who helped Hitler to disrupt Czechoslovakia in 1938 and were expelled after the war) that they should fight to return to their former lands and 'take the lead in wiping out the Bolshevik yoke in Eastern Europe' (*Daily Express* and *Daily Telegraph*, March 28). Seebohm was a member of the Nazi Party, director of a mining concern in Upper Silesia and chairman of two mining companies in Czechoslovakia during the Nazi occupation.

March 28. West German Defence Minister Strauss signed an agreement with Gilson, Belgian Minister of Defence, for German supply depots for conventional weapons in Belgium. He also agreed with his French counterpart Messmer on joint manufacture of a 'transport aircraft' (*The Times*, March 29).

April 3. At a meeting in Munich of the 'Association of Sudeten Germans', Seebohm demanded a plebiscite to support their demand for re-occupation of their former lands; and at the same meeting the Social-Democrat Wenzel Jaksch demanded the *anschluss* (joining) of these territories to Germany (*Daily Telegraph* and *Daily*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Express, April 4). Of course they disclaimed any desire to use force—but with their tongue in their cheek, since they knew that Czechoslovakia, backed by all the Socialist countries, would fight to preserve her territory.

April 4. *The Times* Bonn correspondent reported that, during Macmillan's talks in Washington, the American Secretary of State admitted 'that Germany, because of her past, her geography, industry and lack of experience in democratic procedures, could again become a danger to Europe' (incidentally, just as Lord D'Abernon, the British Ambassador in Germany after the first world war, admitted when justifying the 'White' terror against the working class there in November, 1920). And because of this, Britain had to accept West Germany's growing political and economic power in Europe, exercised through the 'Six' (the European Economic Community).

April 8. The Düsseldorf Court found a group of leaders of the peace movement guilty of 'seditious activity' and sentenced them to imprisonment. Their 'sedition' was no different from the peace campaigns carried on by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the British Peace Committee, many Labour Party branches, the Women's Co-operative Guild, etc. Thus Western Germany becomes the *only* country in Western Europe (apart from Fascist Spain and Portugal) where the Government has had banned, first the Communist Party and then the peace movement.

April 10. Mr. Sebastian Haffner, closely connected with German Catholic emigré politicians during the war, and a regular defender of Adenauer since, published in the *Observer* a modest proposal for the *planned return of capitalism* in the German Democratic Republic (renamed 'Prussia', the most hateful name in German history up to Hitler's day), in exchange for its 'neutrality' and 'internationally controlled arms limitation'. If this brazen piece of impudence were not accepted, Mr. Haffner hinted, 'there will probably be a terrible war one day', since the régime in the G.D.R. 'may prove more than flesh and blood can stand' (in West Germany), 'and fury may prevail' (just as Hitler used to argue that 'my patience is exhausted').

It is easy to understand how the Nazi ministers in Adenauer's Government (and those who share their views), and the Nazi generals and other officers in his army and navy, who have been in a state of suppressed 'fury' ever since their defeat in 1945, are encouraged to let it slip out more and more by such plans.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such demands as those which have been listed here (over a period of less than three weeks!) have been voiced for months and years, but more and more boldly and shamelessly as time went on and encouragement from Paris, London and Washington grew. For that is the character of the aggressive imperialist; you give him an inch and he takes an ell, always finding an appropriate (and different) excuse.

On this point, too, public opinion in Britain should express itself very loudly to the Summit leaders when they meet in Paris. No more encouragement to the Bonn warmakers, it should insist; no more rearmament, no more rocket bases, no more 'supply depots' in other people's territories, strict application of the arms supervision laid down in 1954. And above all, a firm 'no' to the clamour for revision of West Germany's frontiers. Let de Gaulle's words about ensuring peace to Europe by 'the balance established between her two parts which follow different ways of life' be given a practical meaning—by Peace Treaties with both the German Republics, East and West.

'Who cares about the Summit?' asked a leading article in the *Daily Telegraph* on April 12; and it added its own answer, that both optimists and pessimists have begun to lose interest, because 'the general air of cynicism and disillusion, which in the past had contaminated the diplomatic foothills but not the summit, has spread upwards'. This notorious mouthpiece of the cold-warmongers and the Soviet-haters naturally takes its own wishes for reality. On the contrary, as we have seen, cynicism and disillusionment is the last thing that the mass of the people have been showing, whether in Britain or France, in the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. *They* care about the Summit. What is needed is that they should show it to the leaders of the Great Powers, at the Paris meeting which begins on May 16, as plainly on general disarmament and peace treaties with the two Germanies as they have on nuclear tests and better relations between the western powers and the U.S.S.R.

1959 BOUND VOLUMES are now ready.

Have you got yours?

£1 plus 1/6 postage.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BENEFITS OF DISARMAMENT—I

R. W. Briginshaw

General Secretary, National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants

WHEN I was asked to write these few words on some benefits of disarmament, Philip Noel-Baker, M.P., had been telling a meeting that he would bet evens on a nuclear war within ten years. Our children and grand-children, he said, would die; the world, an incinerated ruin, would go on spinning into eternity. I do not agree with him. I have too much faith in humanity and its will to live to believe that this will be allowed to happen. Yet realism sobers further even a cautious faith. With the arms race proceeding, the dire terror of mishap, of nuclear war by mistake, overhangs us. We must work and press the statesmen for a successful outcome to the Summit meetings.

The first benefit would be to relieve all humanity of the dread pall of threatening death and annihilation. Then, to use anew the wealth and resources that have been diverted to wasteful war preparations. At this time propaganda is being conducted on behalf of the government to provide an atmosphere for tax increases or increased charges for the Health Services. The Budget will have told the tale, but the whole expenditure on the Health Service for 1958 was approximate to the expenditure for 1960/1961 on research development and production of weapons at £625 millions. This may even be currently increased, as at this moment it is announced that more orders for H-bombs and atomic weapons are to be placed, sufficient to keep Aldermaston and Burghfield busy for the next two years.

In Britain, where very few major hospital projects have been completed since the war, we could build eight new hospitals with 500 beds in each in place of one aircraft carrier. We could build homes to accommodate 50,000 people for the cost of the Fylingdale so-called 'early warning' Ballistic Missile Station alone. We could raise our standards of life in general terms ten-fold in the shortest possible time. We might need to remove those who would prevent our social advance possibilities from fully blooming. Dreams of the socialist pioneers of a heaven on earth could be realised. Food, clothing and shelter, and technical advance for the millions in poverty in economically backward areas of the world. A great new life for our children and grand-children.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disarmament and peace can mean these things.

Humanity must justify its right to live and continue. We must demand peace and disarmament, the greatest imperative of our time.

BENEFITS OF DISARMAMENT—II

Percy Belcher,

General Secretary, Tobacco Workers' Union

FOR the last eleven years I have been actively associated with the peace movement, whilst my union has consistently supported the many resolutions dealing with this subject raised from time to time at the Trades Union Congress and Labour Party Conference. So it would appear somewhat unnecessary for me to point out the advantages which in my opinion, would accrue—not only to my members, but to all workers throughout the world—if and when nations could agree upon a progressive disarmament policy.

Writing without the figures before me, I believe I am correct in saying that many thousand million pounds have been spent annually by the various nations in what is commonly called their 'defence programmes' but what of course is in fact, a programme preparing for war. When one considers that despite the 'never-had-it-so-good' theme, very few workers in Britain, including my own members, have yet reached a standard of living whereby they can be said to be enjoying life to the full. I know, for instance, that the question of the annual holiday still presents difficulties and calls for some sacrifice on the part of most people and many, in fact, are still content with an occasional day at the seaside, spending the rest of their holiday either on the allotment or in 'do-it-yourself' jobs about the home. It is equally true to say that during sickness, especially sickness of a lengthy duration, most workers are reduced to a very meagre standard of living because of the present fairly low benefits paid in our National Insurance scheme. If we took Britain alone, which it is estimated spends £1,600,000,000 a year on defence, it is not an exaggeration to say that the present unemployment and sickness benefits could be doubled and old-age pensions could be more than doubled. Our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole National Health scheme about which we are so proud could be improved beyond all measure, with the building of hundreds of hospitals and clinics etc., which are still needed; our hospital staffs and nurses could be paid a wage commensurate with the duties they are called upon to perform. Income tax could be almost abolished and we could enjoy a standard of living higher than any other country. All this may sound fantastic; but if you care to examine the position, as you can, from evidence of government spending on the various services, you will find that it is, unfortunately, perfectly true.

Millions of people in what are known now as the under-developed countries, where disease, poverty and bad housing is rife, could for the first time, enjoy standards comparable with those in countries such as our own, and if we are true socialists and really believe in the brotherhood of man, surely this should be our first objective.

It is admitted on all sides today, that if war comes, it most certainly would be the end of the present civilisation and I believe it to be true that no one country is desirous of going to war. As one who has travelled fairly extensively in all parts of Europe, I can certainly say that it is the common desire of all working people to live in harmony and peace together. Why, then, should we continue to spend the millions of pounds in preparing for a war which nobody wants and which in all probability will never happen.

This brings me to my final point and one about which I have written many times. The workers organised in the trade union movement throughout the world have it in their own power to force their governments to agree to such a policy of disarmament; yet because of the present division between the two existing internationals, no real weight has been brought to bear on governments. I suggest, therefore, that without losing sight of other differences, ideological and political, on this one and vital matter, they would be doing the greatest service to their members and to mankind, if they could unite in their demands for agreement on a progressive disarmament policy through the medium of the United Nations. I commend all my fellow trade unionists to do everything in their power through their branches and their executives to bring about this unity in order that we may be saved from this continuous burden and expediture on armaments.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAMPAIGNERS—UNITE!

S. R. Broadbridge*

SINCE the foundation of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament there have been two organisations working for peace in Britain, with differing policies and appealing to differing sections of the public. It has become increasingly clear recently that this benefits none but the opponents of international agreement and that only a united effort can force success in the many negotiations at present in progress. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the results of the General Election have started a massive process of 'rethinking'—not least in C.N.D.

The great contribution of C.N.D. to the peace fight in this country was the demand for unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons by Britain. At first this was mainly a moral appeal—and it is as a moral appeal that it has retained the drive and enthusiasm of its supporters. But, in the day-to-day arguments it became clear that nuclear weapons were not only immoral, but dangerous strategically and politically and that unilateralism was sound political sense. Today unilateralism is essential as a proof of the sincerity of the British government in any negotiations. A Britain pledged to give up the bomb (or to end tests) unilaterally would be clearly fighting for all countries to do likewise and free from suspicion that only lip-service was being paid to the subject. Above all, unilateralism makes it impossible to pretend support while blaming the Russians for lack of agreement.

However, unilateralism is not enough. It must be only a step towards abolition of all H-bombs, everywhere, and it can be a step in that direction only in so far as it reduces tension and improves the international climate. We cannot be 'perfectionists'—we must be prepared to take any such steps, however small, towards our goal of a nuclear-free, disarmed and peaceful world.

At the moment certain policies are clearly essential as an addition to unilateralism. Though Britain must nevermore test nuclear weapons, it is above all essential to get international agreement at Geneva—and force France to be brought in. Mr. Macmillan's recent visit to Eisenhower on this issue is a victory for the campaign but it is not enough; Britain should come out clearly for agreement

*Mr. Broadbridge, as many readers will know, is Treasurer of the C.N.D. North-west Region.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the Russians even if this does 'embarrass' the Americans. Further, Britain should make quite clear her opposition to an extension of the 'nuclear club', above all by opposing revision of the Paris Agreements so as to permit nuclear weapons for West Germany—not, as is so often said, because of Germany's *past* record, but because of W. Germany's *present* record of pressure for revision of frontiers and unrepentant Nazis in high positions.

It is no good abandoning the bomb and yet sheltering behind someone else's 'umbrella'—nor relying on overwhelming conventional forces. Britain must leave NATO, permit no rocket bases on her soil and press for constructive disarmament proposals that will give controlled total disarmament and not merely control.

All these policies have been accepted by C.N.D. in some form or another—though Frank Beswick (*Reynolds News*, April 10, 1960) tried to retain NATO as a 'non-nuclear club' on the specious plea that the U.S. Strategic Bomber Command is not a part of NATO! Therefore it would appear that the obstacles to joint action with the British Peace Committee have largely disappeared. Of course C.N.D. has always, rightly, feared to lose its identity, but that should be no barrier to co-operation on a wide range of subjects.

This is made much easier by a resolution passed at C.N.D.'s annual conference which 'calls upon the National Executive to take immediate steps to recognise and co-operate with all organisations working for peace and unilateral disarmament in order to make a united effort to abolish nuclear weapons'. That this includes the B.P.C. is made clear by a paragraph added to the latter's policy as a result of the suggestions from the many C.N.D. delegations at its National Disarmament Conference earlier this year demanding 'that Britain give the lead by the renunciation and destruction of nuclear weapons, the removal of bases from British soil and the reduction of arms. If possible we should take these steps in concert with other countries, but Britain should in any case take this decision.'

Closer links between the two organisations could be of the utmost benefit in broadening the basis of the peace fight in Britain, since the two organisations have, up to now, appealed largely to different groups of the population. The C.N.D. has appealed mainly to individuals, the B.P.C. to the organisations of the Labour movement as was shown most clearly at Aldermaston and the June 28 demonstration last year.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Co-operation is already beginning with Canon Collins' appeal to B.P.C. supporters through *Peace Campaign*, the B.P.C. broadsheet; the important part played by the B.P.C. in this year's Aldermaston and the increasing participation by trade unions, shop stewards committees and factory groups. Above all, it will be seen in the united demonstration before the Summit after the St. Paul's service and the Trafalgar Square rally on May 15. The same thing must be carried out at all levels, drawing in the supporters of both organisations to a mighty campaign for peace before and during the Summit negotiations.

It would, however, be unwise to extend co-operation into too close an identity. Not all C.N.D. supporters have lost their hesitations over co-operation, not all trade unions have ceased to believe that C.N.D. is a set of middle class cranks. Co-operation should be taken as far as local circumstances permit. In the North-west region, for example, the Manchester Peace Committee has been represented on C.N.D. committees from the start, but there is still far too little trade union representation—and it has not yet proved possible to organise joint activities, though, at least, we are not rivals! The essential basis for co-operation is the realisation that its aim is peace and not the temporary advantage of either organisation.

IT'S OUR FUTURE

Eiblis O'Shea

ON an Easter week-end three years ago the first Aldermaston March began. This is now regarded by many as a historic march, because it led thousands out from under the edifice of the cold war. It was a bid to break free from the established forces, which with enormous mobilisation of press, radio and other means of propaganda and intimidation tried to blot out thinking of the new generation about the dangerous realities of the post-war era.

The young people have led this march. Except for a courageous sprinkling of the older generation, they *were* the first Aldermaston March. Did anyone visualise that young people, at a time when the newspapers to their glee were discovering teddy boys in every street, would show that there was a cause to be fought for—peace? Did anyone visualise in April, 1958, that the movement would grow to the extent that it has done?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some say that the movement against the bomb was and has been non-political. The truth is the opposite. From the beginning it was politics—the desire to change things—but expressing itself not in the framework of established politics. Why should it? Fatalism, cynicism, coupled with violence on an international scale had to be withstood, if we were not to lose our identity and purpose entirely. It is sometimes said that the movement against the bomb is negative, that it is short-lived, and that when the bomb has been banned it will have 'shot its bolt'. Wrong! This misses the vital point. The fight against the bomb is first and foremost a fight for humanity. The fighters against the bomb are fighters against race hatred; they are for the boycott and against proscriptions and witch-hunts. They are for a real full cultural life. The movement against the bomb has been the symbol of young people for the future. While in the beginning all the attention was focussed on the bomb, the movement is now broadening and developing in understanding. The fight against West German rearmament, the struggles of the colonial peoples are all part of the struggle for peace and a better world. The big part played by the socialist youth groups and the Young Communist League in the fight for peace makes this clear.

The International Youth Festivals of past years have helped. They have broken down barriers among youth organisations, not only in foreign countries, but in Britain also. The struggle of today for peace is linked with our future, and more, this is consciously felt. It is our future that Dr. Edward Teller, General Norstad, Dr. Adenauer—yes, and Mr. Macmillan, are trying to destroy. The policies they stand for, dangerous in the past, today in this nuclear age are suicidal.

We are concerned not only with the disasters that will befall our country if war takes place, but also with the disasters that will be encountered if the preparations for war continue. £12,500,000,000 spent in eight years—what could we not have done with that sum of money. Every field of advance for young people is affected by the military burden.

It is said, sometimes by pious old gentlemen in after-dinner speeches in Chambers of Commerce, that the future of the country depends essentially upon its young people. They are right! The youth of today will become the leaders of tomorrow; but if we are to have a real future then we must have a greater say about that future than we have at this present time. Those who want to help the youth peace movement must start from the premise that we do not only want a future—but it is to be *our* future, something we

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forge for ourselves, our own. We intend to have a hand in the building of this future, a future with employment for all; and with the industries that are now being used for war, turned to peaceful works so that we can feel the excitement from achieving things for ourselves.

Now that Aldermaston is over, we must turn our strength to make the Summit a success. Some young people think that discussions and meetings will not achieve anything, mainly because they do not produce clear-cut results. They think this mainly because the statesmen have encouraged these views. This is something that we have to counter. Our movement has to persist relentlessly until it achieves its aim of peaceful co-existence. Drama is all very well —we all like dramatic results. Tilting at windmills can be dramatic —until the horseman's lance drops while the windmill continues to revolve undisturbed. That is how Macmillan and Gaitskell would like to think of our campaign.

The outcome of the Summit conference could be decisions that set the wheels of disarmament in motion. As the existence of a Summit conference is the recognition of the desire of the people for peace, so its decisions could carry those desires in practice into the relations between states. That is what we are working for, and we must never take our eyes off this goal. At the Summit conference we intend to have our say. The Youth Peace Campaign will be at the Summit, to lobby the heads of state. Thousands of copies of our petition are circulating through the country. The signatures and collections will send a youth plane to Paris. We can win the Summit! We can go over the top! But only if we include all young people, not only those in youth clubs, and political organisations, but the young workers in factories and on sites throughout Britain. All of those yet unorganised must be brought into the struggle for a better world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FAILURE OF 'MIXED ECONOMY'

2. *How to Command the Heights*

John Eaton

THE experience of this last decade has established that capitalism cannot break away from the fetters that capitalist property relations impose on the growth of production. Contrast the halting progress of Britain's economy with the steady expansion year after year of industrial production in the Soviet Union. Apart from the break caused by the war years this steady expansion has continued from the beginning of the first Five Year Plan in 1928. From 1950 to 1955 industrial output increased on an average by thirteen per cent per annum and output per worker increased by seven and a half per cent. From 1955 to 1958 corresponding figures were ten per cent and six per cent. Planned increases for 1958 to 1965 are 8·6 per cent and 5·7 per cent. It is the steady maintenance of regular increases that signalises the superiority of socialism as an economic system.

Throughout the fifties the main economic concern of the British ruling class was the strengthening of sterling. It came to an issue as between this and the expansion of the economy in 1955/56 and sterling won. Speaking in February, 1956, Macmillan, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, told the House of Commons:

> There is a general agreement that the combined demand of investment and consumption are going too fast for our economic health.

Between 1955 and 1958 the level of industrial production remained virtually unchanged—evidently the only rate of growth that the economic health of sterling could stand was nil. But let us be under no illusions as to the tremendous national cost of 'managing capitalism' when it involves foregoing economic growth in the interest of financial stability. That we have still not escaped from the dilemmas of monetary policy is evident from the current situation. After a period in which the main problem has been the stagnation of private productive investment, the first hint of a change for the better provokes fears of inflation—exaggerated perhaps for reasons explained above—but nonetheless significant as indicating the continuing conflict between productive and monetary policy.

> The British economy has reached a familiar and awkward stage of the trade cycle: the moment of the sudden superimposition of an investment boom on top of the existing consumer boom.
>
> (*Economist*, January 30, 1960.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The inadequacy of the underlying system is reflected in the results to which a consistent application of its principles leads. The *Economist* points to the danger of overtaxing the mechanisms of the economy when, instead of the previously expected stagnation in investment, an increase of less than one-fifth is forecast—and this today when Britain is crying out for scientific techniques in tune with the times. The five per cent increase in wages to the disgracefully underpaid railworkers causes the *Economist*, quite consistently, to tremble for the stability of the system and to deplore it as an unprincipled concession by

> a government that was returned last autumn with a majority of one hundred for a mandate to continue to keep prices stable and avoid inflation. (*Economist*, February 20, 1960.)

However, again consistently with capitalist tradition, the calculus of inflation is differently applied to war expenditure and the *Economist*, though voicing technical doubts about the Blue Streak, approves the principle of an increase in these terms:

> An increase of the order of 5½ per cent is not unreasonable in terms of the rising national income even after a period in which prices have been stable, if it brings real security. Defence, unlike much else, is not expendable. (*Economist*, February 20, 1960.)

Many Labour theoreticians will say that what was wrong about the 1950's was the way the Tories managed things and not the idea in itself of managing a 'mixed economy'. However, the indications of what the Labour supporters of a 'mixed economy' would have done instead are most confused. In general they stood by the Tory policy on sterling but promised, without explaining how, to combine this with more internal expansion. In fact, the only possible means of stimulating internal growth without precipitating a balance of payments crisis is vigorous and extensive use of import and exchange controls. Controls imply planning, programming, allocation of resources, and necessarily become more and more complex as attempts are made to improve their effectiveness. Half-baked controls invite—and justifiably—oceans of complaints and criticisms. On the other hand, complete control becomes less and less compatible with the rights of private property—and indeed this is the whole point. Once attempts are made to 'manage capitalism' thoroughly, they become quite incompatible with the property basis of capitalism. For reasons such as these I do not think the Labour proponents of 'managed capitalism' could have done much better than the Tories did in the 1950's unless they had abandoned 'managed capitalism' and started to head straight away for socialism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extending controls at the expense of property rights and enlarging the nationalised sector so as to have a stronger economic basis from which to stimulate expansion of the economy as a whole. (It is worth noting that even for the Tories investment in the nationalised industries provided one of their main means of influencing economic growth.)

From the standpoint of economic science every argument points to the necessity of public ownership at least of the commanding heights of the productive apparatus. This must include full public ownership of all the big firms. The 500 giants with net assets of over £2,500,000 each, spread over 25 main branches of industry and distribution, would, for example, provide a basis for planned production and control of the economy as a whole, even if there were political and economic grounds for leaving in being a subordinate private sector of small capitalists. The case against public ownership of the decisive sector is not economic; that is, the real reasons for advocating 'managed capitalism' or 'a mixed economy' are political—namely unwillingness to face up to the political difficulties of challenging the wealthy, powerful, private interests that own the big capital. But, if a proper economic solution is looked for, there is simply no alternative to getting rid of subordination to private ownership and economic conditions imposed by the laws of the market and the laws of commodity exchange. This, I think, becomes clear when some of the other problems facing us are considered. Why can we not do more about raising technical standards, modernisation, investment, etc.? Why is our machine tool industry so backward? Should we not invest more in research in these fields? Are we not now caught up in a maze of interlocking vicious circles? Industry lacks sufficient confidence in the future to put the necessary money into long-term planning and research; the result is low technical standards and high production costs. Also modernisation of equipment, development of automation, application of even existing scientific knowledge calls for pooling of technical knowledge and experience now held apart by the property interests dividing separate firms and branches of industry. Automation in engineering, for example, calls for the closest co-operation between electronics and machine tool production. At present this exists only on a most limited scale and the machine tool industry itself is doing only the meagrest amount of technical research.

In an industry where firms are often too small to support a useful research department or even to finance the development of radically new

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tools one might expect co-operative arrangements. The industry has a share in the Production Engineering Research Association, but its attitude towards this or any co-operative research has always been mixed.
(*Economist*, February 6, 1960.)

Certainly the pressure of events will force a number of technical improvements in British industry despite the obstacles that a behind-the-time property system provides to the social use of scientific knowledge. But if we mean to live fully in the twentieth century we must as a nation free our hands from the fetters of private property. Private ownership of the means of production chops our social labour force into isolated segments and destroys the unity of theory and practice on a social scale, a unity that is indispensable if as a nation we are to keep up with this age of science. The socialist movement today lives side by side with a great and growing movement for peace. If the movement for peace succeeds in making headway, disarmament will begin to release resources for civilian purposes. How are we going to make use of these benefits? At present the Universities spend £12 million on research, industry £85 million and the Government on military research into improved methods of destruction £240,000,000.* It is time we began thinking how to spend this £240,000,000 for creative civilian purposes and I believe that the only sensible way is to consider *simply* how to deploy these resources to meet known human needs. If we had to spend all our time puzzling how it can be made profitable for private firms to employ these resources, the chance is they would soon be dissipated and wasted. In short, the time has come to try to be more simple and socialist and less mixed up about the 'mixed economy'. Planning production for use on a national scale would, of course, involve its own problems but these are problems that experience would teach us to overcome. No amount of experience can overcome the problems of capitalism since they are inherent in its property relations which no longer suit the productive forces that humanity now has potentially at its command.

*These figures are given by Dr. B. V. Bowden in his article reprinted by *The Guardian*, December 10, 1959, from *Universities Quarterly*.

Pressure of space has compelled us to hold over to a later number the recently published (and specially translated for Labour Monthly) *recollections of Lenin by his widow, Nadezhda Krupskaya.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIEWS OF THE WORLD

A Town Condemned

Turbulent Shotts, a traditionally militant area in Lanarkshire which has thrived on coal mining for over a century is now just a shadow of its former self. Mining is almost extinct there, eight collieries have been closed since 1949, with the consequent disruption of a proud and self-contained community. Only one colliery, Northfield, now operates. Its people are now struggling for the right to earn a living in the place of their birth. Scores of them have had to leave their home town for many parts of Britain in search of work and yet at one time it gave employment to many outsiders. Before bus companies were known in the area all types of vehicles were used to convey miners and their sons to work in the fourteen pits which operated in Shotts and employed well over four thousand miners. The thousand now still living here only exist with the minimum of social pleasure; hours added to their day's toil in travelling to collieries and other work outside have considerably reduced their leisure time. The sad demise of Shotts as a coal-producing area has been a gigantic upheaval and one that has caused economic and social hardship to the whole community.

Shotts is also renowned for its cold weather and warmth of hospitality. It is equidistant from Glasgow and Edinburgh. Passing in a train, bus or car, you would not give it much attention. But if you were taking a quiet walk in the country lanes of the district you would observe over in the fields little hillocks of earth thrown up by the mole, known in Scotland as 'the moudie'. That's his mark. A little further over you will see those larger hillocks of earth thrown up by the miner, the human mole. That's his mark; and very often his monument.

Everyone in Shotts knows each other though they may not be on speaking terms. A strange face these days is looked upon with interest because the trend is to leave. It is a town destined to die unless alternative industry is brought in. In 1949 when the first of the pits were closed, all the miners who were classified as mobile were placed in the surrounding collieries or were offered work in expanding mining areas like Fife and Ayrshire. But not everyone likes to move away, even although new houses are offered and travelling expenses paid for the removal. To the young it was mostly an adventure; fresh woods and pastures new. But to the middle-aged (and there are many) it is different. For generations their families have lived in this happy town among the rolling green hills and scenic beauty. They have a burning rural pride of Shotts. There is the economic side too. At the present time there are two thousand people daily travelling out of Shotts to Glasgow, Edinburgh and elsewhere, of whom four-fifths are miners, their sons and daughters. By the end of the week, such travelling expenses mean a reduction in wages.

Shotts is famous for many things. The miners' institute is the hub of activity. There are facilities for swimming, dancing, debating, amateur dramatics, tennis, billiards, dominoes; or you can just sit and chat. The institute with its swimming pool is unique in the whole of the British

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coalfield. No-one knows what will happen to this excellent building when the one colliery, Northfield, closes. Is it going to be allowed to be a monument to a deserted town? Shotts has been stripped of most of its links with the past. Two cinemas, the Pavilion and the Empire have been closed. Only one is left, the Regal. The National Coal Board generating station is no longer there. Blast furnaces whose glow was seen for miles around have also closed. And the gas works too is now standing just a relic of the past. Even the gas consumed in Shotts is piped from Armadale eight miles away. The steam horn which was sounded to signal the start and finish of the shifts at the pits and works has been silenced. The tephone service is also now controlled from outside the town at Bathgate.

Culturally the town is very much matured. The Scottish National Orchestra has performed twice in the town in recent years. In 1951 the various organisations in the town staged a fortnight's activities to celebrate the Festival of Britain. Without government or local authority aid the committee who organised the activities showed a profit which was distributed among local charities. Coronation year—1953—was also celebrated with various entertainments. Holders of the world championship four times, Shotts and Dykehead Caledonia Pipe Band has this year created a record in piping circles, by winning the world, European, British and Scottish championships in the one contesting season. In 1958 the Band made a six-weeks tour of the Soviet Union at the expense of the Scottish Area of the National Union of Mineworkers. The town also boasts of brass, silver and flute bands which have been famous in the past years. Drama, operetta and choral societies are some of the other cultural activities which exist in the town. Athletics also have a place in Shotts sporting calendar. On the fourth Saturday in September for the past ten years, the town has been agog with excitement over the Shotts Highland Games, which attract thousands of spectators, athletes, Highland dancers, pipe bands from all parts of the country—and from England. The games day has become an event for former Shotts people from many countries to return to the town and renew acquaintances with friends of yesteryear. Almost all branches of sport are represented Shotts Bon-Accord football club, which has a stadium envied by many senior clubs, won the Scottish Junior Football Cup three seasons ago. Many of its former players are now in top-grade football both in Scotland and England. This season alone two joined Newcastle United, which is sending a team to play Shotts in a benefit match for a long deserving player, Davie Craig. Juvenile, amateur and youth club football is also played. The swimming pool with its recreation facilities for thousands of school-children and youth in the area has acommodated many star swimmers from all parts of Europe for record-breaking attempts. For the past eight years there has been in existence an inter-town competition between Shotts and Doddington, Co. Durham.

Shotts is certainly a dead town from a coal producing viewpoint, but its energetic citizens who include Margaret Herbison M.P. for North Lanark and ably supported by Frank Gormill, Chairman of the District Council and the rest of the councillors, along with the NUM local branch at Northfield, are working feverishly to bring in new industry. Already an American firm employing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

400 people from a wide area has started to produce high and low horse-power diesel engines for a world-wide market.

It is my fervent hope that by the time these notes appear in print some other substantial industry will be established for the benefit of the Shotts people to put the town in the forefront once again where it so rightly belongs.

WILLIAM MOORE.

(*The writer, as many of our readers will know, is pit delegate at Northfield colliery, and is a leading member of the local Labour Party.*)

Mixed? — It's their Politics

IT has always puzzled me how the idea 'mixed economy' became exalted as a political theory amongst sections in the labour movement. By accepting the legitimacy of a 'mixed economy' as a theory we are swallowing the bait laid by the Gaitskells and Jays. The only thing mixed is their politics. There can be no such thing as a 'mixed economy'. With power in the hands of the ruling class it is Tory economy: and this cannot have escaped the notice of Gaitskell & Co. In Councillor Walters' letter the point he dwelt on most was economic breakdown and slumps. He assumed from this that if the ruling class made certain adjustments here and there—such as regulatory checks on inflationary trends—socialism could be checked indefinitely. This idea overlooks the fact that a serious crisis can exist which can threaten the whole capitalist world not directly connected with economics as such. The South African government at this moment is in deep crisis, and as far as I know not one of the millions of Africans have got their minds on a forty-hour week, increase in wages nor unemployment. The South African government is fully aware of this. I can do no better than quote R. Palme Dutt from the April *Labour Monthly*: 'The national liberation movement of the Asian, African and the Latin American peoples against imperialism . . . is an integral part of the world socialist revolution.' On the same page Lenin is quoted as saying that the socialist revolution can only take place by the proletariat uniting with the national emancipation movements in the undeveloped and oppressed countries against the bourgeoisie in the leading countries.

Compare this wonderful picture, now coming to fruition, with the flabby hotch-potch of 'shareholding socialism' offered to the labour movement as though it was some 3d. off detergent. It has been reported that Mr. Gaitskell sold all his African shares. This raises the question of what happens if a Gaitskell shareholding government had shares in some monopoly—say, in Africa—who were paying a wage of 3s. weekly?

I would suggest to Councillor Walters that he turns his gaze far beyond the Channel.

A. MCDONALD,
Dagenham.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Dmitry Shostakovich
D. Rabinovich
Lawrence and Wishart. 166pp. 18s.

This is the first biographical study of one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest of living composers. As such it is gravely inadequate. There is no complete list of works up to date, no index. These additions would have added little to the cost of the book. Its value would be immensely greater, its cost no doubt somewhat more, had the author included musical examples to illustrate his important explanations of the composer's style and of the content of the eleven symphonies. These defects in the book are doubly unfortunate as they provide a convenient stick with which western music critics can beat Soviet musicologists. The latter, in the writings of Asaviev and Jarustovsky, have provided the most important contributions in the fields of general musical theory and the problems of opera from any country of the world during the past forty years. But western musicology ignores them and remains hostile to the marxist theory of art as a reflection of the world of outer and inner reality, to use Caudwell's terms. It is to be expected that the omissions in this biographical study will confirm the western musicologists in their prejudiced assumption of superiority.

Rabinovich's book is indispensable to conductors and other interpreters of Shostakovich's symphonic and chamber music. Much in the music that is obscure and even repellent becomes clear and more acceptable in the light of the writer's explanations. This biography is somewhat akin to the important work of Schindler on Beethoven. The writer is an intimate friend of the composer and quotes many of the latter's interesting observations and asides. For example Shostakovich is quoted as having once said:

> I wanted to write some good amusing music that would give pleasure and make even the most sophisticated listener laugh. When the audience laughs during the performance of my music or even simply smiles, it gives me pleasure.

The most significant point which the biographer brings out is the way in which the composer has gradually come nearer to the life of the Soviet people. In an article written in 1958, entitled 'Closer to the People', Shostakovich wrote as follows:

> Creative activity is fruitless unless the writer, artist or composer has very close ties with the life of the people. Only he who feels their heartbeats and the spirit of the times can truly express the thoughts of the people; no big work of realistic art is possible under any other conditions.

He achieved this noble aim, so difficult of complete realisation, with the Eleventh Symphony. Great as had been his public successes with the Fifth and Seventh Symphonies, these were crowned by the unprecedented scenes of enthusiasm aroused by the Eleventh. A guest from the German Democratic Republic described them as follows:

> The Symphony was over . . . the public, the whole of the huge crowded hall and we with them were seething with excitement. Whether he wanted to or not the composer of this magnificent revolutionary work had to go onto the stage and accept the stormy applause. He wanted to be and remain a member of the audience. But the Soviet people honoured

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him justly as a man who had enriched their culture and the culture of mankind with an undying work of art.

In this connection I would like to quote a remark of our composer John Ireland, creator of the immortal *These Things Shall Be,* who said to me that after listening to the Eleventh Symphony he had no doubt that Shostakovich was the greatest living composer.

This unity with his people has not been achieved without a long struggle, and the great value of Rabinovich's book is that it traces the interaction of the historical events through which the composer passed and his increasingly intense participation in them, with the development of his creative achievements. In this process he achieved an ever deepening personal unity with the men and women who have made the Soviet Union into the torch bearer of human progress. Each stage in the composer's development has been documented in a symphony and the details of how he attempted this and the extent of his realisation of it form the profound subject of the book. Dmitry Shostakovich emerges as a very great composer indeed and one of the heroic figures of our time.

ALAN BUSH.

Entertainment in the Soviet Union

An Official Report by the Six British Entertainment Workers' Trade Unions

Delegation's Secretary. 2s. 32pp.

The report* of the British Cultural Delegation, which visited the Soviet Union during April, 1959, is perhaps one of the most valuable that has so far been published. It contains little that is new to those of us who have already visited the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, or one of the other People's Republics, but it nevertheless states facts clearly and succinctly without either starry-eyed praise or carping criticism. There are separate sections of the report each dealing with one of the various arts in the field of entertainment, giving much detail about the life and conditions of the artists, technicians and other workers involved in their presentation, whilst the section dealing with trade union organisation should be read by all trade unionists, whether or not they are involved in entertainment, showing clearly, as it does, the important though basically different function of the trade unions under socialism.

The delegation of twelve was drawn from the Musicians' Union, British Actors' Equity Association, Variety Artistes' Federation, Association of Cinematograph and Television Technicians, Electrical Trades Union and National Association of Theatrical and Kine Employees and their unanimous report is perhaps of special value in view of the wide divergence of political opinion represented; there being among them people of Marxist, Social-Democratic and Conservative conviction, others with perhaps no special political belief, and one prominent Advisory Council member of the rabidly anti-Communist and anti-Soviet 'Common Cause'. That they should have presented a unanimous report speaks volumes for the impact resulting from viewing at first hand the great strides made in the U.S.S.R. in the advancement of culture and the general welfare of the people. It also brings home sharply to us the fact of the appalling backwardness of our own society.

HARRY FRANCIS.

*Obtainable from the Secretary to the Delegation, 2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Foundry Workers. A Trade Union History

H. J. Fyrth, B.Sc. (Econ.) and Henry Collins, M.A., D.Phil.

Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers. 348pp. 18s.

'EVERY night pandemonium reigned while the moulds were being cast. The yelling and cursing of the foremen; the rattle of overhead cranes; the smoke and dust illuminated by sparks and flames from the molten metal made the place a perfect inferno. Glad we were, when it was all over, to creep into some corner alive with vermin of all kinds, to close our eyes for a few minutes'. Tom Bell, *Pioneering Days,* quoted in *The Foundry Workers.*

There can be no more than a handful of trade unions in the whole world that can trace back their continuous existence for 150 years. The period spans almost the entire history of the modern working class from its birth at the very beginnings of capitalism to its position today as the class that is ushering in the new society. The handful of foundry workers who met at a pub in Bolton on February 6, 1809 to set up a committee to draw up the 'articles or rules' of the Friendly Iron Moulders Society, started something that has gone on to become the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers we know today.

From the outset it had to fight for its right to exist and it has taken part in all the major economic and political movements and struggles ever since. Many of its members were Chartists, fighting for political rights. The union helped to bring into existence the Trades Councils and later the Trades Union Congress. It went through the political disillusionment with Lib-Lab politics that led to the formation of the Labour Party. It suffered in and fought against all the wars that capitalism has brought in those fifteen decades and it bore, along with the rest of the working class, the brunt of the fifteen or so slumps that the system has produced in the last century and a half.

The record of this union is a cross-section of the history of the working class, indeed of the British people. They fought stubbornly and won—and lost and fought again. Every penny advance on their wages and every improvement in their conditions had to be fought for over and over again. They threw up some outstanding working class leaders. Daniel Guile, their Secretary for 18 years was a man whose

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

NORTHFIELD N.U.M. BRANCH, Lanarkshire, greet miners the world over. Forward in solidarity to socialism, peace and prosperity.

BOWHILL NO. 10 BRANCH N.U.M. (Scottish Area) sends sincere May Day greetings to fellow workers of every race, colour and creed.

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing, Translating. (Private Lessons, Shorthand/Typing.) Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

GREETINGS, regrets, congratulations at home and overseas: Rates as above. What about your English friends, Canada?

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Lab. Mvt., Spain, Russia, Comintern. We collect. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6. RIV 6807.

HAS ANY L.M. READER for sale July, 1921, copy to complete my set? Box 161.

LEFT-WING BOOKS and pamphlets bought. High prices paid. Write: Michael Katanka, 160, Edgwarebury Lane, Edgware, Middlesex.

PUBLICATIONS

NATIONAL GUARDIAN, New York, is the voice of progressive America. Edited by James Aronson. 35s. annually. Order from Collet's, 40, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.

SHOW YOUR OVERSEAS FRIENDS the best in Britain! Send *Labour Monthly* this year. We'll post it for you anywhere in the world for £1 yearly, 10s. half-yearly; or 42s. by air. (U.S.A.: $3; 1st class mail, $4.50; airmail, $7.) Write: 'Subs', 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place in our history is assured. Arthur Henderson of the Labour Party and Tom Bell of the Communist Party were both moulders and each was, in his time, the Union's President. Jim Gardner, General Secretary until he retired last year will be remembered by his fellow workers as the architect of their unity and the foremost fighter for safety in their hazardous job. He will also be remembered by all of us as a great fighter for peace, in which fight he plays a leading part today.

This history is told with amazing detail against the background of economic and political events in Britain and throughout the world. Each period brought its special problems and in tackling them, the foundry men, alongside the rest of the working class, made their impact upon each period. Let nobody regard this book as one for moulders or core makers only. It is a very important contribution to the history of the working class, if only because foundry workers are such key workers and their history covers so long a period.

The union is fortunate in having had the services of such competent and conscientious historians and they, the writers, are to be congratulated on having written such a fine history. Even more are the foundry men themselves to be congratulated on having made that history.

TED AINLEY.

The First Indian War of Independence, 1857-1859

K. Marx and F. Engels
Lawrence and Wishart. 248pp. 4s.

IT is not merely because of Marx's account of the Indian national revolt of 1857, the so-called Indian Mutiny of the English history books, that this collection of his writings about India is of outstanding importance. It is true that most of the book consists of articles written at the time in which he traced the course of events with characteristic political insight. But he did more than this. As early as 1853 he wrote a short series of articles on British rule in India marked by such comprehensive understanding, remarkable prescience and literary quality that they must rank among the great classics of Marxism.*

In these articles he gave a penetrating analysis not only of the colonial enslavement of India but also of the whole basis of the old Asiatic order and the 'fundamental revolution' that was taking place, in which England was 'the unconscious tool of history'. In a notable passage he foretold that the people of India would not benefit from that revolution until either the industrial proletariat won power in Britain or the Indians threw off the British yoke altogether. Marx's awareness in these writings of the effects of capitalist development in India and of the coming national-colonial struggle, is in sharp contrast to the vast literature of rubbish for a century afterwards about the English 'civilising mission' in India or their divine right 'to govern and subdue'. On the basis of his analysis of the Indian structure and the British colonial regime of plunder, Marx was able to disentangle the factors involved in the revolt of 1857. His articles reproduced here, with a few by Engels also, as well as some extracts from letters exchanged between them, cover every aspect of the rising and its suppression, including its international significance. Marx makes it quite clear that it was not

*The *Labour Monthly* was the first to bring these articles to the attention of British readers. In 1925 it published two of them, although translated from a German version and not quite complete.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a 'sepoy mutiny' but a national revolt involving wide sections of the population. At the same time he notes all the causes of its failure, including on the military side the internal dissensions of the rebels and the absence of centralised leadership. A study of these writings, which retain their value in the conditions of colonial struggle today, should do much to counteract the century-old ignorance of Marxism that made even Laski as late as 1927 ridicule the idea of interpreting India in Marxist terms.

CLEMENS DUTT.

The Fifteen Soviet Republics Today and Tomorrow

(Soviet Booklets 60/A to 60/O. 6d. each)

WRITTEN in nearly every case by the premier of the republic, each booklet contains a mass of information. Each is illustrated by well-reproduced photographs. But the meagre maps which do not contain many of the geographic features and towns mentioned in the text, could be improved: while the frequent short single-sentence paragraphs make irksome reading.

The SOUTH WALES AREA of the NATIONAL UNION of MINEWORKERS

The South Wales Miners convey warm greetings for peace and friendship to the peoples of the world. It calls upon all workers of progressive organisations to work as never before to secure lasting peace.

The National Union of Mineworkers

Derbyshire Area

sends May Day Greetings to all trade unionists in Great Britain and throughout the world, and wishes them peace and prosperity.

United Society of Boilermakers, Shipbuilders Structural Workers, E.C.

On behalf of 95,000 craftsmen send warm fraternal greetings to the workers of the world. We must work together for peace and friendship amongst all peoples of whatever creed or colour. *E. J. Hill Gen. Sec.*

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page ii of cover)

profitable sensation intended and a wave of protest which was not, today arouses ridicule as well as disgust. Just how wrong can these war propagandists be? Every political prediction is as cock-eyed as their technique for delivering their out-of-date terror weapon; their lumbering B-36, as Britain abandons production of the Blue Streak rocket which has already outdated it; a glimpse of the war at sea looking like something far more outmoded than Jules Verne. All this, when today's reality is the peaceful Soviet lunik and the proposal for total disarmament within four years. *Collier's* had better produce a Summit number, set in 1964, showing how this 'threat' was defeated in the Council Chamber.

Next month I hope to report to readers and supporters of the 'Out-With-The-Manager' Fund, for I am already on my way out. And here special thanks to two overseas readers who have generously contributed to it. 'California' sends $22 'to complete the Out-With-The-Manager Fund so that Angela can be on her way out of London. On with the struggle!' Also from the Pacific Coast, 'British Columbia' writes: 'Enclosed is $17 for that special fund. I wish I could go out too. Still, I do what I can. When I was in Victoria recently I asked for *Labour Monthly* at four newsagents, and I can't tell you how pleased I was to get the current copy from the last; it was like finding an old friend far from home.' A pity I can't drop in on 'California' and 'British Columbia', whilst I'm out. Later, perhaps—who knows? For in Britain we may be slow starters, but we are sure finishers. This really marvellous response to the special fund is the main factor in breaking two records: we have never received so much in the first quarter; and the March total was the highest ever recorded (the nearest was October, 1943, at £134 7s 8d). Now, stand up and cheer!

And as you resume your seats, please note that we need to raise the *regular* total to not less than half this special effort, if the fresh spring breeze is to develop to a gale force wind of change here. To late comers I would say that amongst some people it would be popular if the Manager was *always* kept out of the office! Total received during March:

£157 2s. 2d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: B. Ainley, 10s; W.B.S., 'Ayr', 10s; H.G.B., 4s; C.T.H., £8; The Humphreys Family, 10s; S. Mill, £1; C.T.M., 12s; C.T.M. (Penny in the £), 6s 4d; M. Illing, 10s; R.F.B., £3; In Memory of Joe Brien, 6s; Royston Green, 2s 6d; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 2s; R. McLeod, 2s 6d; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 6s; L. Bates, 6s; T.W.R., £1; 'Oliver Twist' and Friends, 10s; L. Perkins, 5s; L'Humanité, 4s; M. Brandt, 2s 6d; J. A. Smith, 6s; Socialist Sailor, £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: T. Gittins, 10s; W. Eckersley, £1; M.S. (New Zealand), 5s; H. Davies, 2s; C. M. Sandison, 12s; J. Dunman, 2s; S. Jones, £1 4s; M. R. Mann, 2s; J. Mann, 2s; T.B. (O.A.P., Canada), £1 10s 10d; G. M. Lea, 7s; H.S., 10s; H.E.W. (In memory of M.M.S.), 12s; C.W. (Johannesburg), £5; Blackburn Branch, 1s; Oldham Branch, 1s; R.McC. (Canada), 17s; K. P. Ghosh, 2s; F. Wignall, 2s; P. Feltham, 2s; R. N. Baker, 12s; R. Robinson, 5s; L.M. Conference, Channel Isles, 5s; J.A. (Canada), £1 5s 10d; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; A. Y. Duncan, 5s; D. M. Adams, 5s; C. D. Say, 5s; J. M. Higginton, 14s 8d; H. R. Stringer, 10s; D. R. Morrison, 11s; D. A. Newsom, 2s; K.W.R. (U.S.A.), £2 9s.

OUT-WITH-THE-MANAGER FUND: Anon, £90; Alan Bush, £19; W.R.P. (Canada), £6 5s 6d.

Our thanks to you all,

Co-op. No. L.99482

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide ranges of furs, stoles, cape-stoles, collars, coats, etc.
Full credit facilities

Mention LM for 5% discount

117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey

Phone CROydon 4328

Lytton Bros. Ltd.

We stock top quality men's wear at reasonable prices.

Call when in town, mentioning Labour Monthly.

11 Marchmont Street, London, W.C.1

TERminus 4058

by Russell Square Tube Station

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

LABOUR RESEARCH

British Stake in South Africa
Differential Rents

price 1s. 2d. post free

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

Invisible Spectacles

For particulars of

CONTACT & MICRO-CORNEAL LENSES

Write, phone or call at

8 Archway Road, Highgate, N.19.
(Opposite Archway Underground)

Phone : ARChway 1506

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope), for year's subscription from the.....issue

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED